DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 218 971 FL 013 070

AUTHOR Spanos, George
TITLE Applied Logic for the ESL Classroom.
PUB DATE 82
NOTE 13p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Class Activities; *English (Second Language); Higher Education; *Language Skills; Learning Activities; Logic; *Logical Thinking; Secondary Education; *Second Language Instruction; *Semantics; *Syntax; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS *Paraphrase

ABSTRACT

Restatement and paraphrase, and the syntactic operations that generate them, can serve as the basis for techniques involving explanation, and the production of new sentences in the second language classroom. The basic operations involved are known intuitively by the native speaker but must be taught and practiced if the ESL learner is to get a functional knowledge of English. In addition to practicing paraphrases by such transformations as active-passive, the logical operations underlying the transformations can be defined. Selected with particular purposes in mind, individual sentences can serve as the starting point from which classroom exercises can be created which train or test the students in the syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic aspects of the language. When students are made aware of the underlying logic, systematic application of paraphrase activities results in increased risk-taking, participation and group correction, and a rapid grasp of the logical concepts and operations. Using the operations and concepts defined here, the teacher can design exercises centered on a particular structure which can help the student get a better command of meaning at the same time. Examples are given of the technique as well as of exercises in the four skills, and testing and review exercises. (AMH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED218971

APPLIED LOGIC FOR THE ESL CLASSROOM

George Spanos

Washington, D.C.

1.0 Introduction

Systematic paraphrase activities can be employed in the ESL classroom as a means of eliciting the logical structure of the linguistic units targeted in particular lesson plans. The logical structure of a given linguistic unit is here taken to include the syntactic form, the semantic reference and connotation (truth value) and the pragmatic function of that particular unit. Linguistic units include words, phrases, clauses, sentences and larger stretches of discourse. What follows is an attempt to analyze the notion of paraphrase in such a way that it will be of practical utility for ESL teachers and students.

2.0 Analysis of the Concept of Paraphrase

ESL teachers often resort to paraphrase in their attempts to explain points of form, meaning and function. In addition, paraphrase activities are commonly employed in writing classes in order to allow students to express what they read in their own way. Ordinarily, a paraphrase is defined as a restatement of meaning in a different form. However, we can be more precise by appealing to the following definitions:

restatement: a linguistic unit is a restatement of another linguistic unit if it has a different form but the same general meaning as that unit.

paraphrase: a linguistic unit is a paraphrase of another linguistic unit if and only if it is logically equivalent in both truth value and function to that unit, yet structurally distinct from it.

Depending on the nature and purposes of a particular class, the above distinction can serve as the basis upon which techniques for explanation and production can be incorporated into daily classroom activities. Consider the following examples.

target sentence: Hinckley, who was declared insane, was sent to an asylum.

restatement: Reagan's would-be assassin was committed.

paraphrase: Declared insane, Hinckley was sent to an asylum.

Both the restatement and the paraphrase differ from the target sentence in terms of syntactic form. They also differ in terms of how closely they approximate the meaning and function of the target sentence. Generally speaking, the restatement is the same as the target. However, it requires that the reader be aware of certain facts surrounding Hinckley's case. The paraphrase, on the other hand, requires only that the reader be aware of the syntactic deletion and movement operations possible when dealing with non-restrictive adjective clauses. If the teacher's purposes include the explanation of syntactic rules, he could introduce the paraphrase as a syntactic alternate and explain how it is derived from the target sentence via specific rules of grammar. However, if he were interested in creative activities where extra-linguistic knowledge can be incorporated, the restatement would provide an interesting model for the students. Working up from the syntactic operations which can be used to generate paraphrases, I will show how classroom techniques can be derived.

FL013070

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

George Spanos

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

2.0 Basic Operations

Restatements and paraphrases can be generated by employing the operations generally appealed to in the formulation of transformational rules. The operations of movement, addition, deletion and substitution can be applied either individually or in combination with each other to produce derived sentences which vary in the degree to which they preserve the meaning of the original sentences. The distinction made in 1.0 is intended to capture this notion of variance of meaning in an intuitive way. A restatement will approximate the meaning of the original, while a paraphrase will be regarded as logically equivalent. This may be seen by considering the following examples.

1. movement: move a linguistic unit from one part of its environment to another.

   target sentence (TS): The market will crash tomorrow.
   paraphrase (PP): Tomorrow, the market will crash.

2. addition: add a linguistic unit to a particular environment.

   TS: He arrived on the last day of spring.
   restatement (RS): He arrived on the very last day of spring.

3. deletion: delete a linguistic unit from a particular environment.

   TS: She is the woman whom I love.
   PP: She is the woman Ø I love.

4. substitution: substitute one linguistic unit for another within a particular environment.

   TS: Oedipus was in sore need of a podiatrist.
   RS: The murderer of Laius was in sore need of a podiatrist.
   PP: Oedipus was in sore need of a foot doctor.

The paraphrases given in the movement and deletion categories seem to me to satisfy the criteria set forth in 1.0. That is, they seem to be logically equivalent to their originals in both truth value and function, and require only that the reader be aware of the applicable syntactic transformations. However, the paraphrase given in the substitution category does not obviously satisfy the criteria since it requires that the reader know the definition of the term podiatrist.

The restatements given in the addition and substitution categories require that the reader know more than the syntactic or lexical facts of English. The addition of the word very in the addition example seems to imply that the person who arrived waited until the last minute. Thus, the function of the restatement might not be the same as the function of the target sentence. Likewise, in the substitution example, more is at stake than syntactic rules or lexical definitions. While most speakers of English would at least recognize Oedipus as a proper name, very few would know that he had murdered Laius, his father.

For the practical purposes of the ESL classroom, it is not necessary to insist on an absolute distinction between paraphrase and restatement, even if such a distinction can ultimately be made. The important point in this context is that there are an indefinite number of ways to express a given linguistic unit, and that the means for producing restatements and paraphrases can be usefully incorporated in the ESL classroom. This should become clearer as we proceed.

2.1 Complex Operations

As mentioned in 2.0, the basic operations can be applied either individually or in combination with each other. For example, the active-passive transformation can be represented in the following manner:

TS: Somebody murdered Hoffa.
Step 1: Hoffa murdered somebody. (movement of subject and direct object; syntactically well-formed, but different in meaning from TS)
Step 2: Hoffa was murdered somebody. (substitution of passive verb for active verb; syntactically ill-formed)
Step 3: Hoffa was murdered by somebody. (addition of by; syntactically well-formed; a paraphrase of TS)
Step 4: Hoffa was murdered. (deletion of by somebody; syntactically well-formed; a restatement of TS)

The derivation above combines all four of the basic operations. Unlike the types of representations used in the statement of syntactic rules in a transformational grammar, the above representation is designed to present the ESL student with a step by step illustration of how the passive is derived. In addition, the references in the glosses to meaning make it clear how changes in form are tied to variations in meaning. While the sentence produced in Step 3 is a paraphrase of TS and thus logically equivalent to it, the restatement produced in Step 4 is not logically equivalent, unless we assume that the reader knows what was deleted.

It should be clear that the same type of representation is possible for any set of sentences which are related as paraphrases or restatements. The basic operations provide the student with an explicit statement of the syntactic rule or rules which are involved, while the references to meaning enable the teacher to express how form and meaning are related. Whether or not such representations are used in the classroom is a question which, of course, can only be decided by considering the nature of the class and the purposes of the instructor.

The following complex operations are particularly useful in the teaching of writing:

1. reduction coordination: combine two or more independent clauses into one sentence.

   TS 1: Reggie loves to beat the Baltimore Orioles.
   TS 2: Steinbrenner loves to beat the Baltimore Orioles.
   PP: Both Reggie and Steinbrenner love to beat the Baltimore Orioles. (produced by conjoining the subjects of TS 1 and TS 2 via the addition of and, adding Both, deleting the second instance of the predicate, and substituting love for loves for purposes of agreement)
   RS: Both Mr. October and his ex-boss love to beat the Orioles. (produced by substituting Mr. October for Reggie and his ex-boss for Steinbrenner, and deleting Baltimore)

2. expansion coordination: expand a compound sentence into two or more independent clauses.

   eg. work backwards from the restatement given under reduction coordination.

3. reduction subordination: subordinate one or more sentences to another sentence.

   TS 1: Max worships a woman.
   TS 2: The woman's name is Thelma.
   PP: Max worships a woman whose name is Thelma. (produced by substituting the possessive adjective whose for The woman's in TS 2 and subordinating the resultant adjective clause to TS 1)

4. expansion subordination: expand a complex sentence into two or more independent clauses.

   eg. work backwards from the paraphrase given under reduction subordination.

5. quotation: transform a direct quotation into an indirect quotation or vice versa.

   TS: Papa Bear grumbled, "Someone's been eating my porridge."
   PP: Papa Bear grumbled that someone had been eating his porridge. (produced by adding that before the quote, substituting had been eating for has been eating, substituting his for my, and deleting the comma and quotation marks)

2.2 Related Logical Concepts

We can be even more explicit regarding the meaning and function of our target sentences by appealing to certain logical operations. These are defined below in terms of their relationship to paraphrase.

1. logical implication: there are two types of logical implication:

   a. strong (deductive) implication (SI): whereas paraphrases are logically equivalent linguistic units, a strong implication is a necessary conclusion inferred by a reader or hearer from a particular linguistic unit.

      TS: Wittgenstein, like all logicians, was quite precise.
      PP: Like all logicians, Wittgenstein was quite precise. (movement)
      SI: All logicians are quite precise.

   b. weak (inductive) implication (WI): whereas paraphrases are logically equivalent linguistic units, a weak implication is a probable or possible conclusion inferred by a reader or hearer from a particular linguistic unit.

      TS: Ever since the world was created, the sun has never failed to rise.
      PP: Since the world was created, the sun has always risen. (deletion and substitution)
      WI: The sun will rise tomorrow.

2. logical suggestion: whereas paraphrases are logically equivalent linguistic units, and implications necessary, probable or possible inferences from particular linguistic units, logical suggestions are conclusions inferred from particular linguistic units on the basis of conventional usage or conversational facts; there are two types:

   a. conventional suggestion (CvS): a conclusion inferred on the basis of the conventional usage of a particular linguistic unit.

      TS: Ron wouldn't kiss Fidel for all the farms in Cuba.
      RS: Ron wouldn't kiss Fidel no matter what. (substitution)
      PP: Ron would not kiss Fidel for all the farms in Cuba. (substitution)
      CvS: Ron doesn't like Fidel. (suggested by the conventional usage of the formula for all the X in Y)

   b. conversational suggestion (CrS): a conclusion inferred on the basis of the conversational or contextual facts governing a particular linguistic unit.

TS: In support of his student's request for a letter of recommendation to Harvard University, the ESL instructor wrote, "Mr. Wang is a terrific cook and is able to recognize every single letter in his English alphabet soup."
PP: In support of his student's request for a letter of recommendation to Harvard University, the ESL instructor wrote that Mr. Wang was a terrific cook and was able to recognize every single letter in his English alphabet soup. (quotation)
CsS: The ESL teacher was not overly impressed with Mr. Wang's ability to succeed at Harvard University. (suggested by the irrelevance of the instructor's remarks)

3. logical presupposition (PreS): whereas paraphrases are logically equivalent linguistic units, and logical implications and suggestions conclusions inferred from particular linguistic units, logical presuppositions are propositions which must be true before other propositions can be true or false.

TS: The President has done a great job, (pause) so far.
RS: The President of the Student Council has done a great job, so far. (substitution; more specific in meaning than TS)
PP: So far, the President has done a great job. (movement)
SI: The President is on the job.
WI: The President will continue to do a great job.
CvS: The President will not continue to do a great job. (conventional suggestion of so far when uttered after a pause)
CsS: The speaker is warning the hearer that he shouldn't be fooled into voting for the President in the next election. (conversational suggestion if uttered in the context of a discussion regarding who the speaker and hearer plan to vote for in the next election)
PreS: The President's term of office is not over yet. (presupposition based on the standard usage of the present perfect tense; if this were not true, then TS could not be interpreted as either true or false)
PreS: The President is still alive. (another presupposition based on the standard usage of the present perfect tense; if untrue, then TS would lack a truth value)

The reader will notice that I have provided examples for each of the logical types that might be related to the target sentence used to illustrate logical presupposition. This has been done to demonstrate the fact that any given sentence is related to a vast constellation of restatements, paraphrases, implications, suggestions and presuppositions. Selected with particular purposes in mind, individual sentences can serve as the starting point from which classroom exercises can be created which train or test the students in the syntactic, semantic and pragmatic aspects of the language. It is to these applications that we now turn.

3.0 Applications

There are two basic methods which may be used to incorporate the operations and concepts defined above. The first is to make the students aware of the operations and concepts and then invite them to participate in exercises which require that they produce sentences which are related to selected target sentences. The second is to withold explicit mention of the various operations and types, but to provide examples which give the students an intuitive grasp of what is going on. Naturally,

selection of method will be dependent on the type and level of class being taught. I have found that students respond very well to both methods. In most cases there is increased risk taking, increased participation and group correction and a rapid grasp of the operations and logical concepts when the explicit method is being used. As I will try to demonstrate below, there occurs a controlled creativity in which students are forced to operate simultaneously on the levels of morphological and syntactic form, semantic comprehension, and pragmatic function.

3.1 An Initial Attempt to Employ Paraphrase in a Systematic Manner

The original impetus for systematically applying paraphrase operations grew out of an exercise which I had given to a low-intermediate reading-writing class. The students were instructed to produce both summarized and paraphrased versions of the short paragraphs which appear in the textbook, Comp, by Alexander and Cornelius. The students were having trouble understanding that a paraphrase was something more than just the gist of the paragraphs. Therefore, I began to ask the students to be very careful not to change the meaning of the material that we were working on. In addition, I instructed them to provide glosses of the changes which they had made in altering the form of the material. The students were given examples which taught them the basic and complex paraphrase operations defined in 2.0 and 2.1 above. The following is an an example of what they were soon able to produce:

TS: It is still winter, but on Sunday the weather was beautiful.
PP: Although it is still winter, on Sunday the weather was beautiful.
Gloss: substitute although for but; move although in front of main clause; substitute lower case i for capital I in It.

TS: We decided to go on a trip to the coast.
PP: Therefore, we decided to go to the coast.
Gloss: add Therefore; substitute lower case w for capital W in We; delete the prepositional phrase on a trip.

TS: The sun was bright and warm, but we did not go into the water.
TS: It was too cold.
PP: The sun was bright and warm, but, because it was too cold, we did not go into the water.
Gloss: subordinate It was too cold to the but-clause; add because; substitute i for I in It; add , after but; substitute , for . after cold.

The result of the above exercise was that the students had transformed the original paragraph (represented by the TS sentences) into a new paragraph (represented by the PP sentences) with the same meaning. Used as a group activity, the exercise invited a great deal of participation and gave the students a chance to demonstrate their knowledge of both grammar and meaning in a controlled manner. Not only were they able to make morphological and syntactic changes, but they could also make semantic substitutions (eg. substitution of although for but and the addition of Therefore) and decisions based on pragmatic function (eg. deletion of on a trip, which was made possible because of the generality of the verb go and contextual facts). Therefore, it seemed worthwhile to experiment with new types of exercises such as the ones described below.

3.2 Logical Comprehension Schema

Every language teacher knows that mastery of syntax does not insure student success in the reading, writing, listening and speaking skills. If the student has a poor understanding of the meaning, and particularly of the function, of the syntactic forms, he will not gain the fluency which he is seeking. Using the operations and concepts defined in this paper, we can design exercises centered on any particular structure which help the student gain a better command of meaning and function at the same time that he is manipulating the syntactic form. Consider the following schematic representation of a sentence containing the past-unreal conditional structure:

TS: If American women hadn't wanted equal rights with men as early as 1848, the first women's rights convention wouldn't have been held then. (paraphrased example from Polly Davis, English Structure in Focus, p. 250)
PP: Due to the fact that American women wanted equal rights with men as early as 1848, they held the first women's rights convention then.
PreS 1: Women didn't have equal rights with men before 1848.
PreS 2: The first American women's rights convention was held in 1848.
SI: Some American women wanted equal rights with men as early as 1848.
WI: All American women wanted equal rights as early as 1848.
CvS: There has been more than one women's rights convention. (suggested by conventional use of first)
CsS 1: American women wanted equal rights after 1848. (suggested by facts about American history mentioned in the context of TS)
CsS 2: The speaker or writer of TS advocates the ERA. (suggested, for example, if we knew the political orientation of the speaker or writer)
CsS 3: American women and men have equal rights. (suggested, for example, if the hearer or reader believed that the ERA had been passed in 1848)

Students could be invited to produce sentences such as the ones above in either conversation or writing classes. Such exercises work particularly well when controversial propositions such as the TS above are used. The teacher simply selects such propositions on the basis of the grammatical structure he is attempting to re-inforce and allows the students to work on them either individually or in groups. Or, if the teacher is concentrating on listening or reading comprehension, true-false or multiple choice exercises can readily be created which test student judgment of the propositions relevant to the TS.

3.3 Comprehension Schemata

Sentences and paragraphs can be analyzed in a systematic fashion by following the schematic steps indicated in the following example:

TS: In order for you to follow the schedule set be the publisher, your paper must be looked over over the weekend, revised, and handed in in its final form on Monday. (from Baudoin et al, Reader's Choice, p. 49)

Step 1: After reading TS, students are instructed to expand it, as in the following:

a. In order for you to follow the schedule set by the publisher, you must do three things.
b. Your paper must be looked over over the weekend.
c. Your paper must be revised (over the weekend).
d. Your paper must be handed in in its final form on Monday.

Step 2: summarize the main idea:

a. You must follow the publisher's schedule if you want to have your paper published.
or b. Your paper can only be published if you follow three steps.

Step 3: Write as many paraphrases, presuppositions, implications and suggestions as you can think of:

a. Following the publisher's schedule requires three things. (RS)
b. Somebody has written a paper. (PreS)
c. If the schedule isn't met, the paper won't be published. (WI)
d. You'll be sorry if you don't follow the schedule. (CsS)

Step 4: Analyze several statements about the sentence in as complete a way as possible . (See Step 5 below for an analysis of statements relevant to TS.) This requires that you ask the following questions:

a. Is the statement true, false, or undetermined?
b. Is the statement confused?
c. Is the statement relevant?
d. Is the statement complete?
e. If the statement is true, is it

1. a restatement, paraphrase, implication, suggestion or presupposition of TS?
2. more general than TS?
3. more specific than TS?

Step 5: Select the statement which you feel best represents TS, or which best answers a question (TQ) about TS:

TQ: What must you do on Saturday and Sunday?

S1: You must meet the publisher. (false)
S2: You must examine your paper. (true, restatement of Step 1, b and c)
S3: You must not lose time. (true, suggestion from TS, more general) .
S4: You must revise your paper. (false if the paper can be revised on Monday morning prior to turning it in; at best only partially true since you must look the paper over, too)
S5: You must look over the weekend. (confused)
S6: You must proofread and rewrite your paper. (true, strong implication from Step 1, b and c, more specific than TS, the "best" answer)

By using the above schema, the instructor is able to focus attention on logic and problem-solving. Thus, a single sentence becomes the basis for an entire activity, and students are required to do much more than simply find the "best" answer. As the reader can see by checking the glosses in Step 5 above, S2, S3 and S6 are all possible "best" answers. However, since S6 is more specific than S2 or S3, it has been chosen here. Lively classroom argument can be engendered by asking the students to explain why they think one true answer is a better answer to a question than another true answer. Such argument makes the students responsible for their choices, and shifts attention away from either the teacher or the answer book as the ultimate authority.

The sentence schema serves as the model for the paragraph comprehension schema. However, since complete analysis of several sentences proves rather unwieldy, the teacher needs to be more selective. The students can be assigned particular parts of paragraphs, or they can be told to find the main idea, express it in sentence form, and then proceed to analyze this sentence. Since paragraphs of two or more sentences will be rather rich in implications and suggestions, they provide good opportunities for student discussion and problem solving activities.

3.4 Integrated Four Skills Framework

The concepts and techniques discussed above can be applied within the framework of integrated four skills exercises. For example, if the aim of the lesson is to introduce verbs which take subjunctive noun clauses, or paraphrases of such clauses, a lesson plan like the following can be employed:

Step 1: Grammatical Explanation: the TS is related to other sentences as below:

TS: Everybody encouraged John to see the doctor.
PP: Everybody heartened John to see the doctor. (substitution PP)
SI: Everybody urged John to see the doctor. (if TS is true, then this SI must be true, but not necessarily vice versa)
SI: Everybody urged that John see the doctor. (if TS is true, then this SI must be true, but not necessarily vice versa since we don't know if they urged John or someone acting on behalf of him)
CsS: John needed to see the doctor. (true under normal circumstances)

Step 2: Listening and/or Reading Comprehension: the teacher or the students read the TS; the students then have to answer true-false or multiple choice questions; for example, in Step 1 above, PP and the two SI's must be true if TS is true, while the CsS is probably true if TS is true; see 3.5 below for more examples.

Step 3: Writing/ Conversation Exercises: students are divided into groups and asked to to do the following:

1. make up a role-play in which some future action is being discussed; for example, a party, a trip to the beach, etc.
2. write a short narrative which describes the situation; use verbs which take subjunctive noun clauses; use the simple past tense and indirect discourse.
3. paraphrase the narrative into a direct conversation using presupposition, implication, suggestion and non-verbal communication wherever possible.

eg. "A Party at Min's House" (actual high-intermediate example)

Writing	Conversation
Erdal urged them to listen to the Turkish music all night.	"What about the Turkish music all night?"
Alcachofa explained that she could play the piano instead.	"Boah! I can play the piano. Forget Turkish music!"
Haroun came in and said that he preferred dance music.	"I prefer dance. I can bring records."
Min mentioned that the party would be at her house, so we would have to listen to what she wanted.	"Remember guys. The party will be at my house, so I guess that you should obey me."
(Resignation)	(Shrugs of resignation)

3.5 Testing and Review Exercises

Throughout this paper I have been dealing with the notion that linguistic units can be related to one another via various logical relationships. Native speakers have the ability to recognize these relationships, as evidenced by their flexibility in producing and comprehending their native language. Since a large part of what the language teacher is attempting to do involves training the student in functional competence, and since functional competence is the ability to choose those linguistic units which best express meaning in context, it seems desirable to construct tests and review exercises which force such choices. Below, I give several examples which demonstrate how the concepts dealt with here help us pinpoint functional competence.

3.5.1 Comprehension Exercises (Reading or Listening): Have the students either read or listen to sentences such as those which follow. Ask them to select the item which best answers or completes the question or statement which follows the TS.

TS 1: You have to learn English before you can get a job in America.
Which sentence means the same? (ie., which one is the RS or PP?)
a. You should learn English before getting a job in America. (CvS)
b. You must learn English before you can get a job in the U.S. (PP)
c. All American workers speak English. (WI)

TS 2: Airplane pilots are able to fly planes.
Which sentence must be true? (ie., which one is the SI or PreS?)
a. Airplane pilots fly. (PreS)
b. Airplane pilots enjoy flying. (CsS?)
c. Airplane pilots have a great deal of ability. (WI)

TS 3: Each person needs to take care of his own health.
Which sentence might be true. (ie., which one is the WI, CvS or CsS?)
a. People should take care of their health. (RS)
b. People should visit doctors regularly. (CsS)
c. People sometimes get sick. (PreS)

TS 4: You had better pass this examination!
Which sentence is probably true? (ie., which one is the CvS?)
a. This examination is very difficult. (CsS?)
b. You should pass this examination. (RS?)
c. If you don't pass this examination, you'll be in trouble. (CvS)

TS 5: If only pigs had wings!
The speaker of this sentence believes (ie., the speaker presupposes)
a. that pigs can't fly. (PreS)
b. that pigs can fly. (false under normal circumstances)
c. that pigs are strange animals. (CsS?)

3.5.2 Production Exercises (Writing or Speaking): Have the students read or listen to sentences such as TS 1-5 above. Then ask them to produce, either orally or in writing, sentences such as those which appear as the possible answers above. This will require that you ask them to tell you how to express the meanings, implications or suggestions in a different way than the TS. This can be accomplished by adding more context and then asking what must, might be or is probably true. In addition to requiring the students to communicate the relevant meaning or function, this method will also require that they produce correct syntactic units. Thus, such a method will integrate both comprehension and production.

Test and review exercises such as the ones above require a great deal of caution. Since they involve subtle shades of meaning and probability, the teacher must rule out the possibility that there is more than one possible answer. In particular, if such exercises are to be used as components of placement tests or computer assisted instruction, the students will have to understand the differences between terms like must, might and probably. I suggest the following notations and terms as aids in training the students:

PP: logical equivalence; if A is true, then B is true, and vice versa ($A \leftrightarrow B$)
PreS: logical dependence; if A is to be true or false, then B must be true ($B \rightarrow A$)
SI: logical necessity; if A is true, then B must be true ($A \rightarrow B$)
WI: logical probability; if A is true, then B is probably true ($A \dashrightarrow B$)

The above terms and notations allow the instructor to avoid complicated meta-language. I have not included terms or notations for the CvS and CsS categories since grammatical or extra-grammatical context is too heavily involved to make any simple generalizations.

In cases where these types of exercises are used as class activities, it is possible to invite the students to assist in the decision-making process. Thus, the aim of the teacher can be to generate conversation as a by-product of logical decisions on the part of the students. The following is a portion of a transcript taken from a class in which students were attempting to produce a paraphrase of the sentence, "President Reagan has been to California three times this week."

Student 2: We want deletion, not substitution. Deletion. Take something from sentences. Don't change the mean. Just something from this sentences.
Student 1: Oh, I see. But, you're wrong. Why? Because, see, President Reagan has been to California three times, but he's home now. So have been just this week three times, not future. Person Reagan...

Student 2: Yes, I know this is present perfect.
Student 1: He's home from California now.
Student 3: (inaudible)
Student 2: So if you want use the have been, but many if you want to use the have been.
Student 1: The last time and the now in California.
Student 2: Yes, we know. I know (all laugh). But, just write.
Student 1: You're going to change the meaning.
Student 2: But, don't change the meaning. Just deletion. Please speak English.
Student 3: Continue.

This dialogue indicates that the students are able to bring in prior knowledge ("He's home from California now.") as a part of the activity of employing the paraphrase operations. They also have the opportunity to issue orders ("Don't change the mean."), warnings ("You're going to change the meaning.") and requests ("Please speak English."). Thus, the creativity of the students is elicited within the context of a well-defined task in which they are responsible for the final result.

4.0 Concluding Comments: Putting the Means of Production into the Hands of the People

It is important to recognize the need for certain constraints when applying the techniques described throughout this paper. Given the means for analyzing and

generating linguistic units, it is very easy for the teacher to become overly involved in semantic details and for the student to apply operations which yield ill-formed or inappropriate sentences. For example, a Cambodian student once told me that he had tried to "make some time" with a beautiful airline stewardess, but that he couldn't understand why she had laughed at his opening line. In an attempt to paraphrase "How are you?" the student had come out with "May I inquire about your health?"

Paraphrase activities are best viewed as a pedagogical alternative which serves as an interesting supplement to the daily classroom routine. Such activities are not dependent on any particular type of textbook, although they can supplement any text. Moreover, such activities force students to come to grips with both the flexibility and the limits of the language. In a typical classroom situation, students are responsible for their choices of expression with the teacher available to comment on matters of form, meaning and function.

It is important to note that these concepts should not be regarded as a theory of meaning, although there is a certain resemblance to recent work in linguistic semantics and the theory of speech acts. The references to Katz, Searle and Grice in the list of references serve as a good introduction for anyone who wishes to pursue the concepts in greater detail. Since these concepts allow us to deal with propositional meaning, modality and communicative function, exercises based upon them also fit nicely into notional-functional syllabuses such as those proposed by Wilkins (1976).

Viewing this as a pedagogical alternative which helps students and teachers discriminate between syntactic, semantic and pragmatic aspects of language, the reader might yet question the wisdom of burdening ourselves with unnecessary complications. Perhaps the words of Massey (1970:194) serve ESL teachers as well as logicians: "Measured in loss of perspicuity, the price of maximum economy seems pedagogically exorbitant."

References

Alexander, L.G., and Edwin T. Cornelius, Jr. 1978. Comp: Exercises in Comprehension and Composition. New York: Longman Incorporated.

Baudoin, E. Margaret, Ellen S. Bober, Mark A. Clark, Barbara K. Dobson, and Sandra Silberstein. 1977. Reader's Choice. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Davis, Polly. 1977. English Structure in Focus. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Grice, H.P. 1975. Logic and conversation. In P. Cole and J.L. Morgan (Eds.) Syntax and Semantics: Speech Acts, pp. 41-58. New York: Academic Press.

Katz, Jerrold J. 1972. Semantic Theory. New York, Evanston, San Francisco, London: Harper and Row.

Massey, Gerald J. 1970. Understanding Symbolic Logic. New York, Evanston and London: Harper and Row.

Searle, John R. 1969. Speech Acts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wilkins, D.A. 1976. Notional Syllabuses. London: Oxford University Press.